<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-6, 8-22 and 24-26 remain in the present application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

<u>Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103</u>

<u>Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21 and 24-26</u>

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0156929 by Hekmatpour (hereafter referred to as "Hekmatpour"), in view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2001/0045861 by Bloodworth et al. (hereafter referred to as "Bloodworth"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites method of generating a project datasheet in an integrated design environment comprising (emphasis added):

> accessing project data from an XML database structure, said project data from the integrated design environment and for describing an electronic system design for implementation on a microcontroller programmable system on a chip;
> accessing an XSL stylesheet directed to project datasheets; and
> processing said project data according to said XSL stylesheet to automatically produce a project datasheet file, <u>wherein said project datasheet file includes integrated circuit pinout assignment data</u>.

Independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-10, 12-16, 18-23 and 25-26 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hekmatpour fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said project datasheet file includes integrated circuit pinout assignment data" as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, a datasheet file in created which comprises integrated circuit pinout assignment data. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that a datasheet is a document produced for one or more integrated circuits for use by customers *after production*. As such, the datasheet is public knowledge, and therefore, not confidential.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Hekmatpour to teach the exchange of confidential data with customers for feedback and troubleshooting purposes during design and verification of an integrated circuit and *before* production. For example, Hekmatpour teaches an "XML-based system, method and program product for collaborative web-based design and verification of System-On-a-Chip (SoC)" (paragraph 31). As such, Hekmatpour is concerned with pre-production design and verification tasks, which precede the creation and publication of a datasheet. Additionally, Hekmatpour teaches that the information exchanged is of a confidential nature by stating that "[t]he invention provides a secured, collaborative and distributed environment" (paragraph 31; see also paragraphs 46 and 56). As such, Hekmatpour teaches the transfer of *pre-production confidential* data, thereby teaching away from a datasheet as claimed.

On page 8 of the rejection In the "Response to Arguments" section, the rejection refers to paragraph 13 of Hekmatpour as teaching or suggesting a datasheet. Applicants would like to rectify confusion regarding paragraph 13 by addressing each sentence in turn. The first sentence of paragraph 13 reads: "Output from the design process is published utilizing transformation rules based on Extensible style sheet language (XSL) and is provided to design team members and other personnel, including clients, via XSL style sheets and XSLT transformers, which manipulate data from said SOCML database." While Applicants agree that the SOCML database may contain design information related to a SOC, the text of the first sentence of paragraph 13 clearly states that this design data is published to "design team members," and thus, is secure and confidential information as discussed above. Additionally, Applicants reiterate that this exchange of design information is part of the pre-production design and verification tasks to which Hekmatpour is directed. As such, the first sentence teaches away from a datasheet as claimed.

The second sentence of paragraph 13 reads: "Further output to clients/customers are generated with a platform independent application and services exchange including a universal description discovery and integration (UDDI) director for locating services and a simple object access protocol (SOAP) for exchange and export of data and services." Applicants respectfully submit that any output to clients/customers is also confidential as discussed above with respect to the first sentence of paragraph 13. Such an inference may reasonably be drawn given that both sentences reside within the same paragraph and both mention the word "output." Moreover, noting that paragraph 13 resides within the Summary section of the application, Hekmatpour clarifies the nature of the data exchanged with customers in paragraph 56 of the Detailed

Description: "This provides a secure environment for access management and sharing of customer proprietary data among design teams, which is required for optimized design." As such, information is shared with customers during the design and verification stages, where feedback from customers is then used by the design teams to work out bugs and further optimize the design. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Hekmatpour again teaches away from a datasheet as claimed by teaching the sharing of pre-production confidential information.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bloodworth, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said project datasheet file includes integrated circuit pinout assignment data" as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicants find no teaching or suggestion of a datasheet as claimed. Additionally, Applicants understand Bloodworth to teach an integrated circuit with a variable pinout (paragraph 9). Bloodworth also teaches that "[c]onventional ICs are limited by having a fixed pinout configuration... [a] fixed pinout configuration is not desirable" (paragraph 8). Given that changing an IC's pinout configuration would render pinout information in a datasheet inaccurate, erroneous and/or misleading, Applicants respectfully submit that Bloodworth teaches away from a datasheet with pinout information by teaching an IC with a variable pinout.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that Hekmatpour fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "displaying said project datasheet" and "wherein displaying said project datasheet is done as a single action display" as recited in Claims 4 and 5, and similarly recited in Claims 20 and 21. As recited and described in the present application, a datasheet is displayed. The display may

be initiated by a click (e.g., of a mouse) in a user interface, or a similar single action.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants respectfully submit that Hekmatpour fails to teach or suggest the display of a project data sheet, as well as a single-action display as claimed. The rejection cites paragraph 13 of Hekmatpour and states on page 3 that "the project data is manipulated by the XSL transformations, so that it can be output." Applicants respectfully submit that the mere manipulation of data for output is very different from the display of data as claimed. Similarly, the mere manipulation of data for output is also very different from the single-action display of data as claimed. Additionally, as discussed above, Hekmatpour also fails to teach or suggest, and more importantly teaches away from, a datasheet as claimed. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Hekmatpour also fails to teach or suggest the display of a datasheet as well as single-action display of a datasheet as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bloodworth, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour, fails to cure the deficiencies of Hekmatpour discussed above. Specifically, Bloodworth also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "displaying said project datasheet" and "wherein displaying said project datasheet is done as a single action display" as recited in Claims 4 and 5, and similarly recited in Claims 20 and 21.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that no suggestion or motivation to combine Hekmatpour and Bloodworth in the claimed fashion has been shown sufficiently to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, as discussed in MPEP §2143. Applicants respectfully submit that neither

Hekmatpour nor Bloodworth, either explicitly or inherently, provide a motivation or suggestion to combine the two references in the claimed fashion. The rejection states that one skilled in the art would be motivated to combine the two references in the claimed fashion "since it would have allowed a user to easily view integrated circuit block locations" (page 3). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Bloodworth does not teach or suggest viewing integrated circuit block locations, nor do Applicants find any portion of Hekmatpour that expresses a desire for any such viewing of integrated circuit block locations. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Hekmatpour and Bloodworth in the claimed fashion.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 contain limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 4-5, 8-9, 13-14, 16, 20-21 and 25-26 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 4-5, 8-9, 13-14, 16, 20-21 and 25-26 are also not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth. Therefore, Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are allowable.

Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22

Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hekmatpour in view

of Bloodworth, and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,748,569 to Brooke (hereafter referred to as "Brooke"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth and further in view of Brooke for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Brooke, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour and/or Bloodworth, fails to cure the deficiencies of the Hekmatpour/Bloodworth combination discussed above with respect to independent Claims 1, 11, 17 and 24. Specifically, Brooke fails to teach or suggest the limitations "wherein said project datasheet file includes integrated circuit pinout assignment data" as recited in independent Claim 1. Consequently, since Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth and further in view of Brooke. Thus, Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record, and are therefore allowable.

Claim 10

Claim 10 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth, and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,704,893 to Bauwens (hereafter referred to as "Bauwens"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in

Claim 10 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth and further in view of Bauwens for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that Bauwens, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour and/or Bloodworth, fails to cure the deficiencies of the Hekmatpour/Bloodworth combination discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Bauwens fails to teach or suggest the limitations "wherein said project datasheet file includes integrated circuit pinout assignment data" as recited in independent Claim 1. Consequently, since Claim 10 recites further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 1, Claim 10 is not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth and further in view of Bauwens. Thus, Claim 10 overcomes the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record, and is therefore allowable.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-6, 8-22 and 24-26 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 10/17, 2006   *BMF*
_____

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060